APPLICATION GRANTED
SO ORDERED VERNON S. BRODERICK
U.S.D.J. 8/10/2023

176-25 Union Tumpi
Based on the Parties' representations, it does not appear
Tresh Meadows, We that the scheduling order directed by Fed. R. Civ. P. 16(b)
(347) 450-67 would be productive at this time. Accordingly, I shall

(347) 450-67 would be productive at this time. Accordingly, I shall FAX (718) 228 delay the formulation of a scheduling order until after my resolution of the pending motion to dismiss.

> Leone marun, ⊑oy. Of Counsel

Jonathan E. Neuman, Esq. Attorney & Counselor at Law

August 8, 2023

Hon. Vernon S. Broderick, U.S.D.J. Southern District of New York Thurgood Marshall United States Courthouse 40 Foley Square, Courtroom 518 New York, NY 10007

> Garcia v. Bilotta Re:

> > Civ. A. No. 1:23-cv-04146-VSB

Honorable Judge Broderick:

This office represents Plaintiff in the above-captioned matter. The Court's Initial Pretrial Scheduling Order states that the parties should submit a proposed scheduling order together with the initial letter to the Court describing the case. In light of Defendant's pending motion to dismiss, the parties were wondering if the Court still wants a proposed scheduling order?

We thank the Court for its courtesies and consideration.

Respectfully submitted,

Jonathan E. Neuman, Esq.